

Such an unpleasant accusation, if based upon fact, would be serious but Dr. Brainerd has certainly forgotten that, less than two months before the publication of *R. sativus*, in a letter dated "Middlebury, Vt., Dec. 16, 1899" and written and signed by himself, he wrote the editors of RHODORA:

"If I get my article in by Jan. 1, will you publish it in Feb. Rhodora? ——— is preparing a 'monograph' of the genus. I should like to propose *R. sativus* as a species before he does, as I suspect he will."

Comment is unnecessary.

The plate (X) of *Rubus argutus* shows an inflorescence with no foliaceous bracts and there is no mention of such in the description opposite. Yet on p. 55 we are told that *R. Jeckylanus* is a hybrid which "Resembles *R. argutus* in having leafy-bracted inflorescence." This was presumably a misprint for *R. frondosus*; at least misprints are frequent in the publication. For instance, *R. glandicaulis* (p. 61) is treated as a hybrid of *R. allegheniensis* and *R. setosus* because it "Resembles *R. pergratus* in having pubescent leaves," etc.; *R. frondisensis* (p. 63) is called a hybrid of *R. pergratus* and *R. setosus* because it "Resembles *R. allegheniensis* in having pubescent leaves," etc. Two of these confusions have been corrected in manuscript in some of the copies issued; but the very fact that they passed unchanged through the final proof suggests indecision as to the parentage of the "hybrids." It would be quite unlikely that these inconsistencies would be due to mischievousness of the compositor or to "a too liberal revision of . . . manuscript by the editors" of the Experiment Station bulletins.

But despite the many points in which a difference of interpretation is inevitable and the unconvincing nature of much of the data presented, students of the perplexing genus *Rubus* will find much to commend in the paper. Of great importance, of course, are the records of apparently defective pollen (there is no statement of actual germination-tests) and constancy of seedlings; and everyone who uses the paper will regret that there are so few of the latter records for the 46 reputed hybrids. Finally, special praise should be given the illustrations of species, 31 exquisite full-page drawings, obviously by Schuyler Mathews. These drawings add tremendously to the value of the publication.

CREPIS SETOSA IN OREGON.—Mr. Long's interesting study of the occurrence of *Crepis biennis* (in RHODORA 21: 209 ff.) calls forcibly to mind my own experience with the introduced species of this genus in Western Oregon. When I began to study the flora of the Willamette Valley in 1915, it soon became evident that *C. capillaris* deserved a place among our most abundant weeds, occurring everywhere in

fields and waste places. Along with it, however, I soon began to notice a coarser, more bristly plant of the same genus, which I at first took for the native *C. barbiger* Leiberg. But this species, a lower and stouter plant, seems to be confined to the sage-brush plains of Eastern Oregon, while our plant had every appearance of being an immigrant. During the first season I saw but a few specimens; but each year has added to the number, until it is now almost as frequent as *C. capillaris*, with which it is associated in great abundance in waste places, fields, roadsides and river-banks throughout the entire region adjacent to Salem. Professor C. V. Piper, to whom I pointed it out in 1918, informed me that it was *C. setosa* Haller f., a native of that apparent paradise of weeds, the Mediterranean region, and that I would not be able to find a description of it in any American work. The fact that it has not found mention in any Western manual shows that it must be of comparatively recent introduction and restricted range; but a stranger in Western Oregon would infallibly conclude that it deserved to be enrolled among our most thoroughly established weeds. It would be interesting to know to what extent it has been observed by Eastern collectors. As far as *C. biennis* is concerned, my experience here has been identical with Mr. Long's. I have never seen the plant, or anything like it. Macoun's material from Vancouver Island is probably the basis for Henry's inclusion of the species in his recent *Flora of Southern British Columbia*, 329 (1915); but Mr. Long has shown Macoun's plant to be *C. nicaeensis*, and the existence of true *C. biennis* in the Northwest seems still to lack confirmation. Apparently no native species of the genus have found their way into the Willamette Valley, although *C. occidentalis* Nutt. and *C. monticola* Cov. both occur in the southwestern portion of the State.—J. C. NELSON, Salem, Oregon.

A FURTHER NOTE ON *CREPIS BIENNIS*.—In a recent article on the American occurrence of *Crepis biennis*¹ it was shown that most of the records for the species were based upon misidentifications, and that only three authentic specimens were found in the large collections of the Gray Herbarium, the New York Botanical Garden, the National Herbarium, the Missouri Botanical Garden, and the Philadelphia Academy. The only data on the occurrence and persistence

¹ Long, RHODORA, xxi. 209 (1919).